

coach Peter Laviolette, team captain Rod Brind'Amour and all of the team's players, veterans and rookies alike, on their hard-earned success.

The team's 3–1 win in Game 7 of this year's Stanley Cup finals was proof that hard work pays off.

After years of losses and the trials involved in the team's move to North Carolina, the Hurricanes have conquered the world of hockey by winning the most famous trophy in the world of sports.

Despite hockey's short history in our region and sparse crowds in the team's early years on the ice, I have been amazed at how lovingly the people of North Carolina have embraced the former Hartford Whalers once they became the Hurricanes and owner Peter Karmanos moved the team to our state in 1997.

I am amazed that so many people in eastern North Carolina, who, like me, were not familiar with the sport of hockey, have grown to love the sport because of the Hurricanes.

Even in the town where I live, 68 miles East of Raleigh, I see countless cars flying the Hurricanes flag throughout the hockey season.

North Carolina residents, well-known fans of college basketball and NASCAR, have warmly embraced the sport of hockey by catching Hurricanes fever.

These athletes have become an integral part of their communities by actively involving themselves in the communities where they live.

For this, they have gained the respect and admiration of their North Carolina neighbors and fans.

When I go to a game, I am always so impressed by how many families I see cheering together for the Hurricanes, who we have welcomed into our communities and into the North Carolina family.

Their hard work, talent, and teamwork have been an incredible gift to loyal fans across the state.

There is a saying that a successful team beats with one heart.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the team's Stanley Cup victory, it is without a doubt that the Carolina Hurricanes beat with one heart—the heart of a champion.

I am proud that the Hurricanes call North Carolina home and I congratulate their hard-earned success.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 883.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

BENEDICT ARNOLD PRESS?

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war on terror, and now we are being told we are battling the press as well. The United States has rooted out terror on a global scale. They have also gotten unprecedented help from other countries and international banking institutions to seek out accounts used for al Qaeda money laundering, because without a supply of money, the terrorists have no fuse to light.

Now the New York Times has apparently detailed that security program to the entire world, and we find ourselves pondering what to do when the press willingly reveals national security secrets to terrorists.

Prior to World War II, the United States had broken the Japanese military communications codes. A journalist published a book revealing this classified information, so right before the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, the Japanese changed their codes so the United States was unaware of this invasion.

In 1950, a law was passed making releasing such classified information a crime. If the New York Times has violated this law by becoming the Benedict Arnold press, they need to be held accountable. Not even a journalist from the Times has the right to violate the law just to get a byline.

And that's just the way it is.

REAUTHORIZE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT NOW

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand partly the continued reasoning for the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and I encourage my colleagues from Georgia and Texas to recognize that the vestiges of discrimination still require this particular initiative to be authorized and do so immediately.

This is a Supreme Court decision in the League of United Latin American Citizens versus the Governor of Texas. Specifically it says against this background, the Latinos' diminishing electoral support indicates their belief that the person was unresponsive to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group. In essence, the State took away the Latino's opportunity because Latinos were about to exercise it. This bears the mark of intentional discrimination that could give rise to an Equal Protection violation. The Voting Rights Act protects those from

discrimination and protects their right to vote.

Although this opinion gives a reckless aspect to midterm redistricting, which I hope we can correct legislatively, it does reaffirm the value, the importance and the sanctity of the Voting Rights Act in encouraging and protecting all Americans' rights to vote.

I ask my colleagues to read this opinion for a better understanding of why the Voting Rights Act is an effective civil rights initiative that should be reauthorized.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HOUSE RECYCLING CAUCUS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. DEFAZIO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Members of the other body, Mrs. SNOWE of Maine and Mr. CARPER of Delaware, for forming the Senate Recycling Caucus. Their effort complements the prior formation of the House Recycling Caucus, which I was proud to establish with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GILLMOR.

I would suggest that the House and Senate Recycling Caucuses work together on issues facing the recycling industry in the United States. I would also like to urge my colleagues here in the House to join our respective caucuses.

When most of us think of recycling, we think either of the bright blue bins in our offices, or of collecting cans, bottles and newspapers at home. As important as municipal recycling is to our country, however, it represents just the tip of the iceberg of the \$30 billion-plus manufacturing industry that employs over 1.1 million Americans.

Most of us are probably also unaware that recyclables is one of our country's largest export commodities and are